

1 REMARKS

2 Status of the Claims

3 Claims 1, 3-12, 14, 16-26, 28-32, 34-35, 39, and 41-42 remain pending in the application,
4 Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 14, 16-19, 21-24, and 39 having been amended, Claims 2, 13, 15, 27,
5 and 33 having been previously canceled, and Claims 12, 36-38 and 40 having been canceled in this
6 response, without prejudice, subject to applicants' right to file a continuation application directed to
7 the subject matter thereof during the pendency of the present application.

8 Allowable Subject Matter

9 The Examiner has allowed Claims 25-35. On April 17, 2006, applicants' attorney telephoned
10 Examiner Sajous regarding the status of dependent Claims 41 and 42 that depend from independent
11 Claims 25 and 31, respectively. Examiner Sajous indicated that these dependent claims are also
12 allowed but were most likely inadvertently omitted because of a typographical error.

13 The Examiner has objected to Claims 3-4, 6-11, 16-24, and 38-42 as being dependent upon a
14 rejected base claim, but has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in
15 independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The
16 Examiner indicates that the prior art of record fails to teach a method for lossless editing of a media
17 object that enables representation, user modification, rendering and storing of the media object,
18 wherein the modification comprises the step of cropping the representation of the media object with
19 metadata defining a size and position of a crop outline on the representation of the image to indicate
20 limits of a cropped image (as recited in Claims 38 and 40). Accordingly, applicants have currently
21 canceled Claims 38 and 40 and have amended independent Claims 1 and 14, respectively, to include
22 the recitation of these two dependent claims.

23 Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

24 Claims 1, 5, 12, 14 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable
25 over Perkes (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0110503 hereinafter referred to as "Perkes").

26 As noted above, applicants have rewritten independent Claims 1 and 14 to include the
27 recitation of Claims 38 and 40, respectively, which the Examiner states is not taught or suggested by
28 the prior art. Thus, independent Claims 1 and 14 as now amended are patentable over the cited prior
29 art, and the rejection of Claims 1 and 14 should be withdrawn. Claim 5 now depends from
30 independent Claim 1. Since dependent claims inherently include all of the steps or elements of the

1 independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend, dependent Claim 5 is
2 patentable for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection
3 of dependent Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over the cited art should be withdrawn.

4 In addition, Claims 12, 36, and 37 have been canceled, so the rejection of these claims is now
5 moot.

6 In view of the amendments, it will be apparent that the claims remaining in this application
7 define a novel and non-obvious invention and are patentable. Accordingly, this application should be
8 passed to issue without delay. Should any further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to
9 telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

10 Respectfully submitted,

11
12
13 /sabrina macintyre/
14 Sabrina K. MacIntyre
15 Registration No. 56,912

16 SKM/RMA:elm:cai
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30